

The same is true with endangered species, wetlands. And I notice on this, if this is correct, that of the \$6.5 billion, about half of that is coming from the BIF-SAIF fund. And if you recall, Mr. President, this was an amount of money that was set up to take care of future needs, a reserve, if you will, so that we do not have to go back through the same thing we went through a couple of years ago when this so-called bailout came about. So that the S&L's will be required to put in approximately a one-time expenditure of \$3.1 billion. This will go into a fund so that in the event it is called upon the money will be there, and yet in fact through accounting they are going to be using this money for some other purposes, to fund these programs, the domestic programs the administration wants.

Now, if called upon, that money would still have to come from someplace, so what we are doing through accounting, smoke and mirrors, is just delaying this payment to buy something today.

And then I think the Chair would agree with me, the distinguished Senator from Arizona, who is occupying the chair at this time; he and I have stood on this floor and expressed our concern over what is happening to our defense budget many, many times in the last couple of years. We are in fact operating with a defense budget that is far below the minimum expectations of the American people. The vast majority of the American people when asked, should we be capable of defending the United States of America on two regional fronts, say yes.

And so we had the Bottom-Up Review under this administration. We came up with some figures as to what it would cost so we would be able to meet the minimum expectation of the people of America. And yet we are cutting more and more and more. In fact, it was not too long ago before the Senate Armed Services Committee that the Chiefs of the four services testified to this committee that we are \$20 billion short—that is B, billion dollars short—of meeting those minimum expectations in our procurement account.

So, in fact, Mr. President, we are not meeting those expectations. And yet we find out something between \$350 million and \$1 billion is going to come out of defense—more money coming out.

Right now we have been trying to revive or keep alive a National Missile Defense System. We know for a fact there are some 25 to 30 nations that are either working on a weapon of mass destruction or already have it. We know there are two missiles owned by two countries right now in existence that can reach the United States. We know there are mad people out there like Saddam Hussein who murders his own grandchildren who are working on technology, and perhaps, if they are able, buy the missile technology to deliver a weapon of mass destruction. I

understand that they have, at least we suspect they do have in their possession a biological weapon of mass destruction.

When we have a National Missile Defense System that is 90 percent paid for, all we have to do is kind of reach up into that high tier with maybe some of the 22 Aegis ships that we have and be able to knock down a missile coming at the United States while we have time to do it, instead of that they have cut funding for the National Missile Defense System to the point where it is now delayed. And each year that it is delayed is a year that a threat exists to the American people. And so it is a very serious thing, and we do not know for sure how much more money is coming out of defense. We do not know where it will come from. Is it going to come out of the National Missile Defense System? I hope not.

Is it coming out of the personnel account? Two-thirds of our defense budget is spent on people, and it would stand to reason some of it would have to come out of that. And yet we have soldiers serving right now who are actually on food stamps. So we cannot knock any more out of this account. In conventional warfare, we are now No. 8 or 9, depending on how you measure it, in ground forces. I think Pakistan has passed us up. In my opinion, that makes us No. 9. So we have a very serious problem in conventional forces and force strength, and we cannot afford any more cuts.

For that reason, Mr. President, I am going to listen attentively to the debate today to see if I missed something, but I am anticipating opposing it. I think I can justify it for no other reason than to say look at that, Mr. President. This is something that did not exist 5 days ago. There it is. That is what we will be voting on in order to keep Government from shutting down if the President should elect to shut down Government in the event that he were to veto our appropriation bill.

So I do not like what we are doing. I think we are caving into \$6.5 billion of the President's domestic programs that he has been promoting that this Congress, both Houses agree is money should not have to be spent. Sooner or later we are going to have to do something about all the funding we do around here, the smoke and mirrors. We have troops right now in Bosnia. We were promised by this administration that in December of this year those troops would be back, and if we did not believe it—I did not believe it, and yet when we had a motion, or a resolution of disapproval so that we could keep from sending our troops over to do humanitarian work in the country where we do not have any strategic interests facing our Nation's security and we send them on over anyway, we missed that by four votes. And I suggest, Mr. President, if we had been honest with the American people, if the President had been honest with the American people and admitted that we

were not going to have the troops back in 12 months, then there would be enough pressure on the people of this body, at least four of them to vote the other way and we would not have had to send troops over there. Now they said it is going to cost \$2 billion. Just last week Under Secretary of Defense John White admitted it will be closer to \$3.5 and probably be double that figure. So there is another few billion dollars that are not there, not accounted for.

So, Mr. President, I do not think that I could consciously, unless something happens today, unless I learn something that my studies have not found so far, vote to spend an additional \$6.5 billion on additional programs for the President.

I yield the floor.

Mr. President, I have a message from the leader if it is all right. On behalf of the leader, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate remain in status quo with respect to debate only on H.R. 4278 until 2:30 today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I will not object, I ask that we modify that to give me, if nobody else is seeking recognition, 7 or 8 minutes to speak as though in morning business.

Mr. INHOFE. Yes. Let me modify that to say not to start until 10 minutes from now, and the Senate remain in status quo with respect to debate on H.R. 4278 until 2:30 today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? If not, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Vermont is recognized.

#### RETIRING SENATE COLLEAGUES

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, first, I thank my friend and colleague from Oklahoma for his usual courtesy.

Mr. President, I had spoken before about various Members of this body who are retiring. But last week, as I was sitting at my home in Vermont, looking back down through the list of those retiring Senators of both parties—many of whom, incidentally, visited Vermont at one time or another—I was struck by a common thread. Let me tell you, first, of the Senators who are retiring, and then I will speak of that thread.

Senator Mark HATFIELD of Oregon, the distinguished chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee; Senator PELL of Rhode Island, the former chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee and one of the most senior Members of this body—in fact, I believe the most senior one retiring this year; Senator SAM NUNN, former chairman of the Armed Services Committee and Senator BENNETT JOHNSTON, former chairman of the Energy Committee, both of whom came here a couple of years ahead of me; Senators DAVID PRYOR of Arkansas and PAUL SIMON of Illinois, and ALAN SIMPSON of Wyoming; WILLIAM COHEN of Maine. Senators NANCY KASSEBAUM of Kansas,

HOWELL HEFLIN of Alabama, JIM EXON of Nebraska, BILL BRADLEY of New Jersey, and HANK BROWN of Colorado.

All of these people served with distinction, each for different reasons, each for their own area of expertise. But when you look down through this list, if you are one of the people who handicaps political races, you would have to say, whether you were Republican or Democrat, the thing they each have in common is that each one of these Senators would have been reelected. The Democrats in this list would have easily been reelected. The Republicans in this list would have been easily reelected. A couple have literally run without opposition in the past.

Maybe it says something about this body. To me, it says two things. One is that we have fallen, both here and in the other body, fallen into the habit of allowing things to become too partisan, too personal, and, in many instances, mean. There is too much aiming for the special interest groups of the ultraright or the ultraleft, too often looking for legislation that is designed to be a slogan, rather than to be of substance for this country.

But the people I have mentioned here are the ones who have tried to stay away from that, who have tried to bring us back to the middle, back to the center, realizing at some point Republicans and Democrats have to come together.

I think of MARK HATFIELD and what he has done, both as chairman and as ranking member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, where if there is ever a committee where individual interests sometimes go way over any question of ideology, it is in that committee. How many times he has brought us all together so we could come out for the good of the country.

Senator KASSEBAUM, who in her work, her quiet work but her steady and honest and complete work for this country and for this body, both as chair of her committee and as representative of her State, earned the complete applause of every Member of this body. There is not a Member here who is happy to see her retire. We all wish she would stay. That is obviously the way the people of Kansas feel.

Senator SAM NUNN, who is recognized by Republicans and Democrats alike as one of the foremost voices in this body on defense matters, someone to whom both Republican and Democratic Presidents have gone, as have the leaders of both parties in here, time and time again, for advice and help and support—again, one who brought Republicans and Democrats together.

BENNETT JOHNSTON, who is probably as able a legislator as I have ever served with, again, as both chairman and ranking member, taking legislation through this body that would have stymied anybody else.

ALAN SIMPSON, a person with whom I share a great friendship, as well as, I might say, the same barber. He has an

ability and a very candid, some would say earthy style of bringing us together. He is also a person who has always kept his word to both sides of the aisle.

BILL COHEN is a man who brings a legislator's expertise but a poet's soul to this body. He has worked so often with me and with others on this side of the aisle to craft bipartisan solutions to some of the most difficult issues in this body, ranging from the use of our intelligence agencies to our worldwide power.

HOWELL HEFLIN, with whom I sat in both the Agriculture and Judiciary Committees, the wise judge who, when we are unable to reach a solution, somehow seems to come up with one—again, that brings us together.

CLAIBORNE PELL, one of the most distinguished Members of this body, and most loved Members, a quiet man who, again, always seems to do what is right.

PAUL SIMON, historian, at the time when this body is losing so much of its sense of history, again, he will bring us back, over and over again, not only to what is right but also what is historically right.

You see HANK BROWN, BILL BRADLEY, JIM EXON, people with whom I have either served on committees or committees of conference with them or as cosponsors of their legislation, again, understanding that at some point we have to come together.

I believe I mentioned all in this list, except for Senator DAVID PRYOR. It is no overstatement to say DAVID PRYOR is the friend of all of us. We all understand DAVID'S motivation in leaving, both for his health, and for his family—primarily for family. DAVID PRYOR would not have been contested this year. He would have won virtually by acclamation in Arkansas.

There is hardly a Member in this body who has not gone to DAVID at some point and said, "How do we get out of this impasse? How do we work it through?" I must say, President Clinton, in good days and in bad days, has been fortunate to have DAVID PRYOR here, as one he could speak to and from whom he could get an honest assessment, and also one we could speak to, whether we had good news or bad news for the President.

All of these people will be missed, but I don't think we can overstate that what we have lost by these Senators leaving. They leave behind a body that grows increasingly polarized, and the country suffers, the Senate suffers. I have said so many times—it is a mantra almost to me—this body should be the conscience of the Nation. The conscience is one where we come together collectively and speak to the best instincts in the greatest democracy history has ever known. This requires men and women of good will in both parties to recognize the differences in each other's region of the country, in each other's philosophy, sometimes in each other's goals \* \* \*

but, through all that, to understand ultimately it is the United States' goals that must be met. It is this country's goals that must be met, but it is also the history and the integrity of this body that must be preserved.

We are making decisions for our children and for our grandchildren. They are going to live most of their lives in the next century. Our decisions should be for that next century, not just for this week's partisan gain or this election's partisan gain or this evening's news.

So I hope when we come back into session in January—and I will be one who will be here—that all of us, Democrats and Republicans alike, will pledge to follow the examples of so many of these Senators I have talked about, and work to come together, not to further polarize, both this body and the other body. In the end, neither party gains or loses an advantage by that polarization, but the country does lose—it loses badly.

Every one of us will say goodbye with fondness and affection to these Members of the Senate. Each one of us will miss these Members of the Senate, no matter which party we belong to. But I might add, if we want to honor their distinguished service in this body, let's do it by pledging, as we come into the 105th Congress, that we do it with more a sense of comity, of accommodation, of bipartisanship and upholding the Nation's interests and the responsibilities and respect and proud history of the U.S. Senate.

#### TRIBUTE TO JOHN A. DURICKA

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an Associated Press article about John Duricka, written by my friend, Jim Abrams, be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. INHOFE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

[See exhibit 1.]

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, John Duricka was not only one of the finest photographers I ever knew, but also one of the best reporters of the Capitol. His photos will illustrate our history books for decades and generations to come. He was a man who suffered greatly in the last few months of his life with cancer, but few of us knew how badly it was.

I had a conversation with him at the beginning of the summer in which he talked of going to the Republican and Democratic Conventions. I told him I was looking forward to seeing him at ours and would probably be asking him for tips on exposures and angles for my own photography at that convention. It became too much, and he did not make it there, and more is the pity.

Last week, there was a memorial service for him there. Many spoke in eulogies of him. They spoke of a man who always had to get the photo but never forgot there were other photographers he worked with. Over and over,